LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES (LLIDS)

ISSN 2457-0044
CC Attribution-No Derivatives 4.0 International License
www.ellids.com

Elsewheres of Desire: Indian Cinematic Landscapes as Spaces of Transition

Debjani Mukherjee | University of Auckland
http://ellids.com/archives/2021/07/4.3-Mukherjee.pdf

Abstract | Contemporary Indian popular cinema has undergone a radical thematic and aesthetic shift with the arrival of the multiplex as a cinematic exhibition space. The multiplex first appeared in India in 1997, its spaces becoming entwined with the narrative of the urban transformation of India's metropolitan cities in the image of global urban spaces. The multiplex screen too has become an extension of this desire for transformation, its cinematic space charged with the frisson of an expanded geographical imagination. This psychogeography of an *elsewhere* that appears on multiplex screens thus opens up a spatial imaginary that is composite of a more expansive terrain of possibilities, enabling us to see where "we" are not. This paper examines two films, *Shanghai* (2012) and *Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara* (*ZNMD*) (2011), exploring the contrasting ways in which they frame and narrativize their respective landscapes to unfold this desire of an *elsewhere*. *Shanghai* is set in the fictitious city of Bharat Nagar in contemporary India, its narrative revolving around the desire to rebuild Bharat Nagar into another Shanghai, while *ZNMD*, with its protagonists on a road trip, is set mostly in Spain. Shanghai and Spain may be real places with geographical markers, but they are also *elsewheres*, their locatedness in reality fueling their potency as topographies of the mind. This paper explores how the spaces of *Shanghai* and *ZNMD*—one desolate and marginal, and the other transfused with movement and vitality—are spaces of potentiality, functioning as doorways to the imagined, offering in their affective potency the opportunity of transformation.

Keywords | Indian Cinema, Exhibition Space, Multiplex Theatres, Film Exhibition, Cinematic Landscape, Globalization, Film Aesthetics, Liminality, Psychogeographical Imagination, Foucault, Heterotopia, Transformation, Consumerism

The multiplex has been complicit in the changing of the urban landscape by reclaiming urban space and actively involving itself in the erasure of old areas and landmarks, and through replacing old infrastructural and social arrangements. The multiplex screen too articulates a parallel experience of globalized urban modernity, as it pulsates with the energy of a new cinematic landscape. The "symbolic break from the past" that the multiplex architecturally initiates within the matrix of the urban landscape, with its bold angular lines defined against the urban skyline, making architecturally explicit that the old structural form of the city is being replaced with a new one, finds resonance in its screens (Athique and Hill 129). This is not just reflected in the material "break" in the transition from analogue to digital screens, with digital film copies and projectors replacing 35mm prints and analogue film projectors, but also in initiating a shift in the way that people go to the movies. In doing so, it has engineered a shift in the entire "psychogeography" of the spectatorial itinerary (Bruno 40). Cinema-going now takes place within a different set of material conditions and traversing them involves a negotiation of space of a different exhibition site. It is a new terrain where layout, lighting, décor, and sound come together to constitute a specific "spectatorial architectonics" of cinematic exhibition (30). This incites an engagement that is both physical and psychological for the multiplex spectator, moving as she does through spaces designed with a specific intent. It activates a new sequence of impressions and views, and formulates a new kind of engagement in the experience of this architectural exploration—in the play of light and glass, in the lines of movement of stairs and escalators, and in the layers and depth of this space. Cinema-going becomes a narrative molded by this space, its architectural topography binding itself to spectatorial life, setting off the multiplex spectator on a new itinerary, as she views, peruses, wanders about, and finally settles into the plush environs of a darkened auditorium.

Energized by this new space and its changed interiors, audience demographics, technological innovation that encompasses production to exhibition technology, the new media network, and the distinct material and aesthetic impulses that arise from it, the filmic space too pulsates with an imagination that is aligned with the social and cultural forces of a new modernity. As a modernist vision in urban space, the multiplex's particular mobilization of its space is the articulation of a new way of seeing. Screen narratives trace the imaginative pathways of a new spectatorial journey unfolding a new imaginative geography. In this shift, the screen becomes a conduit for the visible manifestation of a changing world. It summons a range of compositional and cinematographic elements to articulate this changing spatial and urban modeling of the real world, projecting a contemporaneity that signals a new way of being.

The multiplex first arrived in India in the middle of 1997 with the opening of PVR

Anupam. Once a single screen cinema hall, Anupam was retrofitted to become a multiplex by its owners, PVR (Priya Village Roadshow Ltd.), whose formation was made possible by an alliance between Priya Exhibitors Ltd. and Village Roadshow Ltd., an Australian multinational company (CNBCTV18). The multiplex subsequently spread across urban India, mushrooming in the major metropolitan cities in its first phase, and, in the wake of its saturation there, spreading to other towns and cities, covering a wide swathe of larger urban India. In 2016, PVR Cinemas was India's largest multiplex chain with 497 theatres across India; the rest of the market was shared between three other operators: Inox Leisure, Carnival Cinemas, and Cinepolis (KPMG–FICCI Report). In 2019, multiplex penetration continued to grow in tier-2 and tier-3 cities[1] (KPMG Report); PVR with 812 screens was the clear market leader, with Inox Leisure, Carnival Cinemas, and Cinepolis following with 612, 450, and 381 screens, respectively (Statista). The coronavirus pandemic induced a lull in its expansion in 2020, but PVR announced that it will open 40 new screens in the financial year 2021–2022 (Pinto). The appearance of the multiplex no doubt introduced a new shift in the film exhibition landscape which had hitherto been populated only by single screen theatres. By targeting the urban middle class with disposable income and with tickets priced higher than those of single screen theatres, it started changing the economic logic of film exhibition. Middle class audiences found themselves readily swapping the "single commodity activity" of the single screen for the multi-media consumerist experience that a multiplex offers (Athique and Hill 9). From this point onwards, the multiplex set about radically changing the film exhibition business, and by extension, the cinematic menu on offer.

Indian popular cinema[2] had already begun changing from the early 90s. Spurred by the economic liberalization of 1991, the industry saw an expansion in its overseas market, which continued during the rest of the decade. Indian popular cinema now stepped out into the larger global domain as "Bollywood, thus becoming embedded in an economy of consumption, serving the global nation well in economic terms" (Vasudevan 339). The effects of market forces which followed the larger policy of privatization and media deregulation was first unleashed in this period. It crystallized in the cinematic narratives of the multiplex, which displayed "the multifaceted ethos of middle-class life" within the structure of a generalized consumerist culture (Gopal 134–140). Until the entry of the multiplex, it was the single screen staple, the Indian popular film—delivering a complete entertainment package with action, comedy, and romance—that dominated the cinematic landscape. Multiplex films deliberately broke away from this "homogeneity of the all-embracing format of the social film and the *masala*," displaying a diversity and multiplicity of genres, emblematic of the social and cultural forces that constitute Indian modernity of the new millennium (3). The films thus render the world as a particular and distinctive effect of the intersecting trajectories of urbanization, middle class formation, consumerism, and globalization—all of which operate within the larger matrix of economic liberalization. It replaces the large heterogenous audience of the single screen

[1]Indian cities are classified as X (tier-1), Y (tier-2) and Z (tier-3) based on population density. Cities with a population range of 50,000-100,000 are classified as tier-2 cities, and those with a population of 20,000-50,000 are classified as tier-3 cities. There are 8 tier-1 metropolitan cities, 104 tier-2 cities and the rest fall into the tier-3 category (mohua.gov.in).

[2]*Indian popular cinema* here refers to Indian mainstream commercial cinema in the Hindi language produced in Mumbai, India.

with a smaller, exclusionary, middle class one, "utilis[ing] a homogenising milieu to advertise a wide spectrum and subjectivities" (134). When the multiplex first appeared in the metropolitan cities, the films on its screens geared towards these audiences and displayed decidedly urban themes, a western sensibility, and a formal inventiveness. But as the multiplex spread, further targeting the burgeoning middle classes in larger urban India, it became less concerned with formal experimentation, focusing instead on the new sociology of the couple and characterized by the novel narrative technique of the "multiplot," which provides the perfect structural framework for "the simultaneous representation of multiple character types who together signify the middle class as a differentiated collective" (138, 141). As the multiplex now expands and spreads to more areas of the country, the cinematic menu has adopted an even more expansive address to include even wider sections of the audience. The cinematic menu now includes updated versions of earlier masala action films, along with the usual multiplex categories of middle class comedies and low-budget indies.

Even as it brought about these changes in the cinematic landscape, the multiplex has also been complicit in the changing of the urban landscape structurally. The contemporary urban landscape is a transformation-in-progress as it is being reclaimed, redrawn, and redesigned to be recreated in the image of a Western commercial society. Athique and Hill observe how in this "desire to create global cities capable of bringing together flows of international capital […] land for new developments is made" available through "a raft of regulatory changes favour[ing] public-private partnerships and commercially-oriented development projects," to create "valuable new public space" in urban India (2). Multiplex theatres become part of this spatial re-engineering of the urban landscape as a key leisure infrastructure of the New Economy, with massive investments and tax incentives given to encourage their development (2). They reclaim urban space and are actively involved in the erasing of old areas and landmarks, their locational dynamics influencing the shrinking or expanding of urban distances. Their emergence within the matrix of the urban landscape replaces old infrastructural and social arrangements. Structurally, they are thus inextricably intertwined with this narrative of post-liberalization urban transformation; the quality of space that they shape, hold, and exude articulates this desire of transformation and re-creation into the image of the global urban spaces of a western *elsewhere*. The multiplex thus initiates a "symbolic break from the past," making architecturally explicit that the old structural form of the city is being replaced by a new one (129). In this dynamic, its screen also becomes an extension of this desire for transformation, tracing the emerging shape of a new urban landscape, concurrent with this unfolding narrative.

This article analyses the two films, *Shanghai* (2012) and *Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara*[3] (*ZNMD*) (2014), to locate the new psychogeographical aspirations of the contemporary urban imagination through a close reading of their narratives. The two films, though radically divergent from each other in content, style, and treatment, embody a compulsive desire of the *away*. The article argues that in this desire of the *away* is the aspiration of an idealized *elsewhere*, offering an experience of a globalized urban modernity. The screen thus makes space for a new spatial vision to express this

[3]*Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara* can be translated as *You Only Live Once*. Translated by author.

manifestation of a changing world, unfolding vistas that hold this potential for an audience cued to a new psychogeographical imagination. Their cinematic landscapes are thus layered locations, holding breadth as well as depth; they articulate an experience of place, which, in both films, apart from their contextual meaning within the narrative structure, acquire the ability to transcend the narrative frame in which they were conceived. The two films frame and narrativize their landscapes in contrasting ways; exploration of the *elsewhere* of the urban imagination in this article is wrought through the prism of their landscapes. It takes the term *landscape* in the urban context, in a more expansive way, not restricted to simply panoramic vistas of open spaces, but also the topography of the city space. The *idea* of landscape that this article seeks to consider is also an *experience* of it, as it comes invested with meaning and emotion, associated with memory, and bound to identity. Its significance or potency is only as strong as the hold it has on our imagination, in the ways we encounter it and frame it in the context of our lives, in the ways it forms the crux of our negotiations between the self and society.

Hazel Andrews and Les Roberts, in their introduction to *Liminal Landscapes*, question if landscapes, on account of their being "processual" (in terms of their being shaped and produced by human or natural processes or agents) and "in a constant state of transition and becoming," are "intrinsically liminal" (1–2). Liminality,[4] in that sense, embodies a certain spatio-temporal process. In the chronology of before and after within the timespan of our lives, landscapes transform from new to old, thus embodying a certain temporality along with its obvious spatiality. A consideration of this intrinsic liminality of landscapes underlines their malleability and expands their cinematic possibilities. The liminality of cinematic landscapes rests on the inherent spatial nature of cinema and, as Juhani Pallasmaa suggests, in cinema's ability to "define the dimensions and essence of existential space" as well as in its ability to "create experiential scenes" (*Architecture of Image* 13). It is in the context of this embodied nature of cinematic experience, in its affordance of an intertwining of our material and psychological worlds, that landscape can assume a more dynamic role than as mere backdrop. In fact, Eisenstein's suggestion of landscape as "the freest element in film, the least burdened with servile, narrative tasks" acquires resonance in this regard (217). W. J. T Mitchell's consideration of landscape as a *medium* of representation rather than as mere image or symbol opens it further to a range of possibilities. Mitchell's conception of landscape as dynamic lends itself particularly well to the study of cinematic landscape. His emphasis on the elemental aspects of landscape—what he calls as "a physical and multisensory medium […] in which cultural meanings and values are encoded"—prevents its slippage into the background of the story space and connects it to the tradition of which it is a part (14). His insistence on the landscape's ability to not only act as a medium of expressing value, but also "for expressing meaning, for communication between persons" underlines the malleability of landscapes, how they can be seen as "a body of symbolic forms capable of being invoked and reshaped to express meanings and values" (15, 14). In foregrounding landscape from its usual status as setting, it acquires the density of a text,

[4]Liminality as a concept gained momentum with the work of anthropologist, Victor Turner, who describes it as any situation or object that is "betwixt and between" (*Forest of Symbols*). Turner, whose writings have laid much of the theoretical groundwork for our understanding of liminality, considers the liminal as a doorway or transitional space, a sort of a border.

open to be read and decoded, pliable to an array of interpretive activity.

Thus, a consideration of landscape as different from the story space opens it up to an exploration of its aspects beyond the narrative world. The concept of the *location* then changes from backdrop to a reflection on landscape as a construct and an expression in its own right. In this shift, landscape unveils the interacting ideas, conventions, and traditions that inform its representation, and the essentially palimpsestic nature of such image making. Landscapes on the contemporary Indian screen carry the resonance and energy of the accelerated change of the present-day urban space. In unfolding spaces, whether of home or away, it is in the processual, transitional nature of their unfolding that they become doorways of "a physical as well as a psychic space of potentiality": their liminality becoming a generative act in the construction of the *elsewheres* of urban desire (Andrews and Roberts 1).

As a space of urban desire, *elsewhere* appears on screen as a heterotopic space, summoned by the work of imagination as well as material and social construction. Foucault, in his 1967 essay "Of Other Spaces," describes spaces that exist in relation to other sites as "a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted" (3). Foucault's heterotopia are those real spaces which function as sorts of counter sites, offering a counteraction, whether in terms of their function or nature, existing in a kind of structural or temporal counterpoint. This concept springs from his premise that space in "our epoch […] take[s] for us the form of relations among sites" (2). It is heterogeneous, multi-dimensional, constitutive of both internal and external space, real as well as fantastic. Lived space, in fact, constitutes a set of relations among sites "which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another" (3). In this grid of spatial interconnection, Foucault's heterotopias, "simultaneously mythic and real," offer spaces that in their *unlikeness* or deviation from the normative provide a divergent experience (4). From the cemetery to the cinema, the honeymoon hotel to the museum, the brothel to the library, these heterotopic spaces exist in a contradictory relation to all other sites, but linked in a configuration where the dissimilar experiences of space and time are juxtaposed against others but nevertheless exist as a continuum among the sites that make up the ensemble of our lived space.

Elsewhere thus becomes a collective construct envisioned, projected, and designed by a collective imagination to effect what Arjun Appadurai calls "a transformation of the real," changing new urban spaces of the city into glittering islands or filling up the screen as "an expansive terrain of possibilities" ("Right to Participate" 34). This "transformation of the real" is an experiential exchange of feelings and meanings between where we are and where we are striving to be. The conundrum of the mirror experience where we "discover [our] absence from the place where [we are] since [we] see [ourselves] over there" can be extended to the embodied experience of *elsewhere* on screen because in seeing ourselves where we are not, we reconstitute where we are, which Pallasmaa[5] suggests happens when we engage with any work of art, making us "encounter ourselves and our own being-in-the-world in an intensified manner"

[5]*The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema*, 2001.

(Foucault 4; Pallasmaa 22). It is a heterotopia in the sense that though it is envisioned and projected by a collective imagination, it is still a place or a conglomerate of places with geographical markers. *Elsewhere* thus straddles both the virtual and the real, its locatedness in reality fueling its potency as topography of the mind, awakening desires and fantasies, directing our intentions, emotions, and thoughts.

But while the mirror's heterotopia, which despite opening up an "unreal, virtual place" behind the surface, is a tangible reflector, *elsewhere*, its geographical locatedness notwithstanding, is an imaginative prism (Foucault 4). The imaginative effort brings it close from afar, as it molds itself to the concrete matrices of the structures of the New Economy or unfurls across multiplex screens. It is this activation of the imagination that creates images of *elsewhere* as an embodied and lived space. Appadurai's[6] insistence on imagination as a vital force in the production of any kind of a scalar or material structure or framework as well as Pallasmaa's[7] suggestion that it is the activation of the imagination that makes the artistic image shift "from the physical and material existence into a mental and imaginary reality" underline the permeable boundary between the mind and the world that makes *elsewhere* possible (Appadurai; Pallasmaa 63). It becomes a construct of this intertwined experiential dimension of our material and psychological worlds, deriving its suggestive power from the tension between the perceived and the imagined. Fueled by the collective imagination capable of reaching "multiple scales and spaces and forms and possibilities," *elsewhere* insinuates itself into "structures of feeling," enticing images and feelings, turning our attention to ourselves and our place in this continuum of spaces spanning the local to the global.

The screen as an integral entity moored within the physical place of the multiplex informs the reading of the two films, as the article considers that both the material space of the multiplex and the experience of its screens constitute intersecting terrains. The multiplex and its screen come to exist in a particular confluence of flows of architectural design, economic conditions, social grouping, technological innovation, and cinematic storytelling. It thus becomes part of the modernist project of the reconfiguration of the city space, designed and sustained as a purposely created set of spatial relations. Entry to this space incites a connection to the global spaces of urban culture and a sense of participation in the transformations of a post-liberalization economy. Appadurai observes that the production, maintenance, distribution, and enjoyment of physical spaces are conscious acts on the part of "social actors," as "physical spaces are part of the material that individuals work from, draw on […] highlight, sharpen, consciously use" ("Illusion of Permanence" 3). The spatial logic of the multiplex engages its patrons in an itinerary of the imagination reaching into multiple forms and possibilities: "to walk through its doors is to pass into an 'other' India, continuous with the smooth spaces of global capitalism" (Gopal 133). The nature of the traversal of the physical space of the multiplex plays out in the traversal of cinematic space too, inciting a similar journey, the screen being a structural extension of this entire experiential terrain.

This *world* within the multiplex is both imaginary and material, composed of

[6]"The Right to Participate in the Work of the Imagination," 2002.
[7]*The Embodied Image*, 2011.

competing, complementary, and overlapping symbolic as well as spatial orders, and it is in the intersections of these different discursively constructed worlds that a filmic landscape emerges on the multiplex screen, articulated with notions of a new modernity. Furthermore, this cinematic site, affected by the mutations of the city, is also entwined in this reconfiguration of urban space, operating within the diverse contexts of a new urbanity. Modern cities are continuously fluid and shifting places, "always susceptible to erasure or brought into different relations with emerging structures," and the multiplex's structural evolution, technical upgrading, and spatial relocation evolves out of and is tied to this geography of concurrent relations and meanings (Hay 226). In linking itself to the larger space of the city and appropriating its own meanings, the cinema hall becomes a product of its transactions, standing in relation to places and events that form and transform the narrative of the city. Negotiated and traversed by a corpus of spectators and imbued with the particularities of spectatorial life of the time, it becomes a product and a space of transitions and transactions, developing intimate ties with the city.

Foucault had evocatively stated that "we are in the epoch of simultaneity […] of juxtaposition […] of the near and far […] of the side-by-side […] of the dispersed […] our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein" (1). In the contemporary landscape of even more accelerated simultaneity and juxtaposition, of connected points and intersections, what Appadurai terms as "the work of the imagination"—this envisioning of "the global as a kind of expansion of the horizon of the local"—reaches "multiple scales and spaces and forms and possibilities" ("Right to Participate" 34). As the horizons of globality appear through the manifold networks of media and migration, it becomes the material with which the imagination works to infuse and interweave with the spatial and the material, the scalar and the embodied dimensions of local life, to produce desired structures of being and feeling. It assumes tangible shape in the angular lines of the transnational architecture that appears across the vista of the urban landscape and unfolds on multiplex screens as geographies of an idealized *elsewhere*.

Thus, if *elsewhere* appears in the metropolitan urban spaces of India's New Economy, by laying out a vista of spectacular structures, it also appears on multiplex screens whose spatial vision seems to outline a new psychogeographical imagination (Athique and Hill 130). The two films under discussion in this article, *Shanghai* and *ZNMD*, unfold in these spaces of a new imagination. *Shanghai* presents a fictional town of Bharat Nagar in India primed to be razed and rebuilt while *ZNMD* unfolds mostly in the *real* landscape of Spain. The former's spaces are desolate, marginal, marked by a certain stasis, and existing in the economic in-between-ness, while the latter is transfused with movement, vitality, a sense of adventure, and travel. They unfold in vistas that offer facets of the contemporary urban experience, with their narratives of hope and oblivion, of travel and reconciliation. At the same time, they also embody quests, journeys, and passages of transformation, launching trajectories of movement and connections. But while *ZNMD*'s spaces unfold as a tangible reality, *Shanghai*'s spatial vision, even while staking out the territory of the contested space of an Indian city, harkens to an aspirational dreamscape, a chimera. But both these films fall among the considerable number of films of the past decade which took off from the teeming urban spaces of India to the freeing

expanse of a distant landscape. The city seems to "become a transit camp to a better life," as the screen gives shape to these imagined spaces of collective desire, and *elsewhere* appears as a shared dream of the collective urban imagination, imbued with possibilities (Bamzai).

On the occasion of the release of *Shanghai*, the director of the film, Dibakar Banerjee said in an interview, "The title of the film is a comment on what we are as a nation. We don't like living in our own country. In our minds, we want to migrate to a foreign land. The film is about the Shanghai of our dreams and how we are fighting to achieve that" (Bhatia). The plot of the film, which was adapted from the novel *Z* by Vassilis Vassilikos, alludes to that time when the Indian government, at the turn of the millennium, went on a drive to set up Special Economic Zones (SEZs) for business and industrial development in various parts of the country. Special areas were identified for the setting up of these economic zones and the government went on mammoth land-acquisition drives for the purpose. But as dams, mines, thermal plants, business hubs, software parks, industrial plants, malls, and multistoried apartment blocks continue to be built, it has also engineered a large-scale displacement and splintering of communities. Dispossession of their traditionally held land and unsatisfactory rehabilitation has led to political and social protests, and in some cases even long-drawn-out armed conflicts. The SEZs, Sardar Sarovar Dam Project, and Vedanta-Niyamgiri mining project are only a few of the contentious issues that mark this conflict over land in contemporary India. *Shanghai* references this issue of large-scale land-acquisition by the government for industrial or business purposes and its far-reaching social and political repercussions.

Shanghai derives its drama from the machinations resulting from the state government's attempts to go on a massive land-acquisition drive to build a swanky business hub called the International Business Park. The poor residents of that land vehemently oppose this drive. In spite of the fact that it would evict thousands of people from their land, the construction of the proposed International Business Park is touted as a model of growth and progress for the state, as one more step towards the collective political dream of transforming Bharat Nagar into another Shanghai. Matters come to a head when a left-wing activist spearheading their resistance is killed in a hit-and-run accident. The ensuing chain of events reveal that it was a premeditated murder, exposing the murky underbelly of local politics and laying bare the complicity of the local government, police, and bureaucracy in the matter.

In telling the story of Bharat Nagar—Bharat being another name for India—*Shanghai* is basically talking about the fraught spaces of contemporary India as a whole, the narrative explicating how land in 21st century India ignites conflict and political power play, driving fissures in the social fabric, dislocating and dividing communities, and splintering cityscapes. The embattled streetscape of Bharat Nagar mediates an idea of a nation under siege, caught in the crossfire of rapid change and social upheaval. Dibakar Banerjee shot most of the film in the small towns of Latur and Baramati in Maharashtra in western India, drawing from the natural environment of these places to craft the space of his film. Skirted by an expanse of dusty landscape, *Shanghai* creates a prototype of small-town India—a network of winding alleys and densely packed houses, narrow streets filled with rambunctious political rallies, nondescript government offices,

and spacious official bungalows—embellished by a diverse imagery of colourful shop fronts, brightly coloured signage, promotional arches, and election campaign paraphernalia of banners, festoons, and massive cutouts of political figures.

As a film expressly about land per se, landscape in *Shanghai* can be seen to constitute a metanarrative about contemporary India. Shifting focus onto *Shanghai's* landscape unearths this aspect of its thematic expressiveness, its implicit articulation of a reciprocal link between land and national progress. The large-scale reconfiguration of the Indian urban ecology is producing complex but paradoxical social arrangements within the spatial dynamic of the city space: the spatial fissures in the urban landscape reflecting the societal fissures of post-liberalization India. In these "splintered urbanist sprawls," the rebranded urban spaces reflecting the values and lifestyle of the new middle class marks out a new India, demarcating it from the old (Sundaram 64; Athique and Hill 129–130). This is where *elsewhere* resides, balancing along that faultline where the places of "financial, economic, cultural, discursive, as well as spatial and architectural manifestations of globalisation overlap" (King 135). In deconstructing this desire for an *elsewhere*, the film spotlights the class struggle that complicates this desire.

In *Shanghai*, *elsewhere* shimmers beckoningly in Bharat Nagar's horizon. The desire and anticipation of its impending arrival transforms it into a heterotopia, holding up a mirror to where we are not, but potently enabling, in its imaginative intensity to envision us there. In his book, *The Great Clamour*, Pankaj Mishra writes about the "defiantly modern" landscape of Shanghai. He describes "skyscrapers of a postmodern snootiness, gleaming new industrial parks – with landscaped gardens," "American-style luxury condominiums with names such as 'Rich Gate,'" and the "wreckage (of demolished low-rise houses) surreally reflected in the glass facades of tall office buildings." It is this *defiantly modern* landscape—shaped by, as Mishra calls it, the "storm of progress […] propelling the angel of history into the future even as a pile of debris grows at his feet"—that circulates in the popular imagination. *Shanghai's elsewhere* is this vision of a shiny but debris-strewn landscape set to be replicated in the shape of a swanky International Business Park to be built on the razed land of Bharat Nagar.

In this imaginative intensity, the landscape assumes a processual nature, in a state of transition and becoming, suspended in a state of in-between-ness. When Dr. Ahmedi, the academic-activist spearheading the Bharat Nagar resistance, arrives at the small Bharat Nagar airport, he observes the expanse of barren land flanking both sides of the road, signposted by a giant hoarding bearing the picture of a cluster of shiny multistoried apartments, proclaiming it as the site of "Windsor Heights." The landscape is framed from Dr. Ahmedi's point of view, through the windscreen of the moving vehicle, the hoarding of "Windsor Heights" standing out against the starkness of the dry dusty land ringed by makeshift fencing. Framed in a moving shot, with the camera panning from the windscreen to the open window of the car, the landscape passes by, its emptiness stretching into the far distance, foregrounded by the "Windsor Heights" signpost, extending the invitation to "Come! Live the Luxurey!" (*sic*). This sequence of Dr. Ahmedi's passage through the expanse of dusty landscape, reclaimed for construction purposes, visually suggests the possible future for Bharat Nagar.

The dry, featureless expanse of the proposed "Windsor Heights," roofed by a flat sky, and signposted by a hoarding which visualizes its future transformation, is a composite of juxtaposed meanings, forming a densely layered image. In this image, the physical reality of the landscape is juxtaposed with a photographic image, framed in a tense co-existence with each other. The tangibility of the dusty land assumes significance against the illusory quality of the photograph, its shiny tall buildings seemingly tenuous against the solid physicality of the landscape. But the image promises a complete transformation that would erase the present landscape, and it is in this promise of its inevitability that the image acquires power. The landscape and the image do not exist in a dynamic of the present and the future, rather they effect a dynamic of the past and the present—the expanse of vast barren land has already receded into the past, as the image takes over the present, exhorting to "Call 2484501 NOW!!" to "COME! LIVE THE LUXUREY!" (*sic*). It is in the "NOW" that the image exists, while the landscape, its physical tangibility notwithstanding, has retreated and regressed into the past, presenting an interesting contrast between the real as unreal and the unreal as real.

In this dichotomous arrangement of the old and the new, the tension between the two landscapes is in the contrasting *ideas* of them. The image landscape of "Windsor Heights" comes pre-coded with the "Globalisation Dream," activating an imagination that locks in with the idea of a *modern* landscape of tall towers and landscaped gardens. On the one hand, it is a descriptive image, interacting with a character viewpoint as well as existing in a layered juxtaposition with the physical landscape behind. But as it stakes its claim on this vast expanse of land, it also remains autonomous with its own narratological function, as well as being rich in symbolic content. The "Windsor Heights" sequence is illustrative of Banerjee's comment that his "film is about the Shanghai of our dreams" (Bhatia). The sequence explicates the dream of transformation that the *idea* of "Windsor Heights" encapsulates; the signpost festooned across the *tabula rasa* of the emptied landscape directs our gaze towards it and in doing so invents that dream.

The landscape, in its evocative charge, thus starts to convey an unrelenting sense of what lurks beneath, carrying within itself this channel between the past and the present, emerging as a conduit of loss and change. The flipside of *elsewhere* are the scenes of urban strife and despair, of contested spaces and interests, and the desperate efforts of survival for the displaced and discarded. Amidst the manic streets of curfew-bound Bharat Nagar, bonfires burn and masked rioters clash with the police. The camera assumes various vantage positions in framing this landscape—hoisting itself onto the back of a truck careening through packs of frenzied rioters running amok through city streets, tracking along rows of shuttered shops and randomly pitched battles between rioters and police, and, in the aftermath of night-long rioting, wrapped in the blue haze of daybreak, looking down from the top of a terrace at the desolate debris-strewn lane, and later coming down to frame a scarred city street in wide angle, a dead body strewn across, a lone policeman radioing for help, standing against a grey sky while smoke billows out from the still-burning bonfires of tires. In contrast to the immersive experience of its structured dramatic situations, the camera drifts around this scarred landscape, in an open-ended engagement with this vista of urban dystopia.

"[B]orn at the intersection of mental, physical, and social space," the imagined city explicates the particular synergy between urban experience and film (Mazumdar

xviii). From the post-independence period to the post-liberalization and globalization era of the Indian economy, the cinematic city has always registered this shift in urban experience, rendering visible the new spatial and temporal configurations of the urban landscape. The large-scale migration to the cities that followed from the post-Independence period onwards meant that Indian popular cinema steadily accrued an urban bias, overtaking its rural centric tilt of the 1950s and 1960s (Athique and Hill 31). With the 70s, the city entered the screen as an autonomous space with its own thematic concerns, leaving behind "the city-country dyad" of the 50s and 60s cinema which had served to "privilege the values of the countryside as well as assert the precedence of national identity and unity over thematics of class conflict and urban disillusion" (Prasad 98). During the 70s and after, the city emerged on screen "as a self-sufficient space for the staging of epic conflicts and allegorical narratives," also bringing in a new visual perspective of the city in cinema, which Prasad terms as "view from below" (as opposed to the "view from above" skyscrapers and tall buildings), a subaltern perspective which reinforced "a strong sense of community solidarity" (98, 93). In *Deewar*[8] (1974), for instance, he notes how "the city scape is invested with new affect, the skyscrapers reminding the spectator "of the labour that went into its construction," whereas the studied evocation of Bombay's slums in *Nayakan*[9] (1987) expands cinema's access to the city beneath the metaphorical city of allegorical tales. *Parinda*[10] (1989) and *Satya*[11] (1998) continued in their realistic evocation of the Bombay milieu and the rootedness of the characters in it, without investing them with nostalgia for the pastoral bliss of the idyllic rural (93).

In fact, for Indian popular cinema, Bombay has always been the city of choice, but Prasad notes that Bombay's position as default metropolis is more to serve as a "generic metropolitan other" rather than as a specific city. He identifies two cinematic Bombays, one belonging to the period of the 50s—"a city of pleasure and danger, of a thrilling anonymity as well as distressing inequality […] a space where class conflict is a dominant thematic concern" and the other of the 70s and after—where "a new Bombay makes its appearance, more vivid, dense, naked, disorienting […] where the thematics of class conflict acquire an epic dimension and are inscribed into larger national-allegorical and civilizational frameworks […]" (87–89). The phenomenon of Indian popular cinema evoking a metaphorical city rather than a specific one follows a long trajectory of films right from Homi Wadia's *Miss Frontier Mail* (1936) to Ram Gopal Varma's *Satya* (1998) to Anurag Basu's *Life in a Metro* (2007). The contemporary screen now also makes space for an urban experience which has expanded beyond the major metropolitan cities to a newly urbanized population. Mass crowds, urban violence, consumption, and spectacle characterize this "urban delirium," transforming the urban ecology of major metropolises and altering the skylines of suburban India (Mazumdar xxii). A diverse range of narratives express the complexities of this contemporary urban experience, mediating journeys in a range of perspectives that shape the cartography of this post-globalized

[8]*Deewar* can be translated as *The Wall*. Translated by author.
[9]*Nayakan* can be translated as *The Hero*. Translated by author.
[10]*Parinda* can be translated as *The Bird*. Translated by author.
[11]*Editor's Note* (*hereafter referred to as Ed. N.*): *Satya* can be translated as *Truth*. But in the movie, it is the name of the protagonist.

cinematic city.

Shanghai's imagined space contains both an imagined *elsewhere* as well as the grim reality of its actual location. It comprises the small town of Bharat Nagar that stretches from its dusty outskirts to its dimly lit streets, as well as the *idea* of Shanghai that presents itself as a dream landscape of chrome and glass, of sky-high towers, industrial parks, and shiny condominiums. The cinematic geography of the film thus holds both the mythic and real, with both Shanghai and Bharat Nagar existing as spaces of possibilities, where the imagined experience of an *elsewhere* arises out of the fraught dynamics of Bharat Nagar's own spatial politics. *Shanghai*'s Bharat Nagar is an *everycity*, articulating "the contemporaneous remaking of its urban space" in the image of globalized metropolises, bringing forth structures of transnational architecture to shape a new skyline and transform the existent urban morphology (Athique and Hill 39). While the narrative of *Shanghai* explicates how land in 21st century India ignites conflict and political power play, the landscape pulsates with the urgency and immediacy of its contested spaces. Meanwhile, the *elsewhere* of Shanghai looms large and fuels this contestation.

What *Shanghai* holds forth is a mirror to the cost of this pursuit of an urban *elsewhere*, offering a scathing critique of this fantasy of *elsewhere* and the human cost it entails, linking this fantasy of the *away* to its story of dislocation. Making space for *elsewhere* involves large-scale displacement and estrangement from the familiar, and into the unfamiliarity of the likeness of a distant phantasmagoria. In explicating the ways in which the politics of "place-making"[12] unfolds, *Shanghai* lays bare the structure of a class based hierarchical society and the unequal ways in which power is distributed. In the displacement of communities is the erasure of memories, meanings, and identities tied to the particular place. As a new sense of place is given shape, the land is wiped clean of the vestiges of the past. It sets the stage for a present as a play of imagined futures.

Unlike Shanghai in *Shanghai*, which is more of an imaginative construct, a place where we are not but striving to arrive at, Spain in *ZNMD* is not a tantalizing distant *elsewhere*, but an easily accessible reality. It is not an imagined future, but exists in the here and now of the story world of the film. It is a place the three leading characters travel to, flying in from different parts of the world to meet up in Barcelona. In this casual accessibility of Spain, the distant is brought near and made familiar, linking it to the itinerary and the cultural imagination of the globalized Indian. While the struggle in *Shanghai* is in shaping the existing landscape into the image of a foreign *elsewhere*, glimpsed only in animated promotional videos of the future and in giant hoardings of multistoried towers, in *ZNMD* that *elsewhere* is already here. It is enveloped in the present of the film space, which its characters seamlessly step into with casual nonchalance. In contrast to the chimera of Shanghai that was preeminent in *Shanghai*'s experience of landscape, *ZNMD*'s experience of *elsewhere*—comprising a mosaic of locations across the length and breadth of the Spanish landscape—is tangible. The flow of locations unfolds in a sensuous rhythm, supporting the ambience of journey, discovery,

[12]The term "place-making" is used by geographer Yi-Fu Tuan used in Topophilia to describe the ways in which we form close connections with landscapes.

adventure, and freedom. From the art nouveau architecture and Gaudi buildings of Barcelona to the Costa Brava coastline and then on to the Andalusian region and the Basin of Pamplona, the beauty of the Spanish cities, towns, mountains, and coastline fill up the frame to create the singular experience of the film's landscape. As the three young men set off on their road trip from Barcelona, their journey culminates in an altered relationship with their selves and with each other.

ZNMD falls amongst a slew of films, made at the turn of the millennium, whose characters, in breaking away from the constraints of home, find freedom overseas. Protagonists of films like *Dil Chahta Hai*[13] (2001), *Salaam Namaste*[14] (2005), *Hum Tum*[15] (2004), and *Chalte Chalte*[16] (2003) follow the similar trajectory of a narrative arc where a new setting unfetters the lead characters from their dilemmas and impulses and sets them up on a road to personal transformation. Later films—like *Queen* (2014), whose protagonist finds liberation in Paris and Amsterdam; *Tamasha*[17] (2015) and *When Harry Met Sejal* (2017), where the lead pairs break away from the humdrum ordinariness of their lives and discover themselves and each other in the open country of Corsica and Amsterdam, respectively; and *Dil Dhadakne Do*[18] (2015), where the entire film takes place aboard a cruise ship on the Mediterranean—all follow the same template. The setting becomes an accessory of their transformation, the landscape an accomplice to their process of personal change. The newness of the physical topography thus becomes a foil to the newness of their being. This is in contrast to the common trope of foreign landscape as fantasy setting for romantic interludes, employed regularly in Hindi films, especially from the 60s through the 90s.

In fact, in the pre-liberalization era, foreign landscapes would unfold on the screenscape of Hindi cinema mostly as locations of fantasy or dreamscapes for choreographed song sequences, the *foreign-ness* of the landscape showcasing and heightening the sudden break in the narrative. Switzerland was one of the most favoured locations, the archetype of the romantic landscape, for song sequences set against the snowcapped Alps and the rolling green of the Swiss landscape. Rachel Dwyer notes that "[t]he early Hindi films showed Kashmir as the ideal location for romance, and it was only in the 1970s that this site came to be displaced by Europe – above all Switzerland […]" (197–198). Anointed by the mainstream press as the "king of romance," Yash Chopra, veteran Bollywood director and deliverer of blockbuster hits right from the 60s to the 90s, had a penchant for shooting romantic song sequences in Switzerland. Framed as a dreamscape, this particular landscape became identified with romantic desire and intertwined with the cultural imagination and longings of millions of Indians. Dwyer observes that "[t]hese places also constitute some sort of privacy for the romantic couple, a private space in the public domain, where they can escape from the surveillance of the

[13]*Dil Chahta Hai* can be translated as *The Heart Desires*. Translated by author.
[14]*Ed. N.*: Wikipedia translates *Salaam Namaste* as *Hello Greetings but it* can also be translated as *Salute and Welcome*.
[15]*Ed. N.*: *Hum Tum* can be translated as *Me and You*.
[16]*Chalte Chalte* can be translated as *As We Walk By*. Translated by author.
[17]*Tamasha* can be translated as *Spectacle*. Translated by author.
[18]*Dil Dhadakne Do* can be translated as *Let the Heart Beat*. Translated by author.

family which prevents, encourages and controls romance, love and marriage" (197–198).

On screen, the mountainous Swiss landscape came to represent a fantastical element, and its unfolding within the diegesis opened up a space where the story and characters could inhabit that fantasy realm in varying degrees. Abraham and Torok define fantasy as "all those representations, beliefs, or bodily states that gravitate toward […] the preservation of the [topographical] status quo" (125). In the romantic song sequences set in Switzerland, the landscape represented an extension of the erotic topography of the mind, in resistance to the *normal* topographical setting of the narrative (125). In this "fantasy of incorporation," Switzerland became the natural extension of the psychological "topographical status quo," the landscape assuming even more formal significance in the romantic musical interludes where it inhabited an extra-diegetic space. In this dynamic, landscape assumed a conceptual significance in its own right, a dreamscape of freedom, devoid of restraint or inhibition. This brings into focus how a particular landscape becomes the frame of a specific fantasy space, becoming the cultural reference point of an entire generation. It also illuminates how malleable landscapes are, becoming the screen onto which ideas are projected, pliable to be shaped by a collective imagination to produce a specific structure of feeling.

The Spanish landscape in *ZNMD* is not a fantasy setting or an interchangeable ephemeral dreamscape existing as an extra diegetic interlude. Rather, it constitutes the entire diegetic space of the film; its geographical locatedness is rooted as tangible physical space, fostering an audience engagement that links it to their own physical world, a post-globalized world of hypervisuality, simultaneity, and juxtaposition. *ZNMD's* Spain slots into this grid of spatial interconnectedness, becoming the mental frame that activates our imagination and directs our associations, emotions, and reactions. The journey through the landscape becomes a sort of rite of passage for the audience, granting them associative free play in their imaginative traversal of the landscape. The song sequence where the three friends are driving through the open countryside, flanked by sunflower fields on either side with majestic white horses running alongside them in slow motion, structures a magical experience on screen. It is not exactly an extra diegetic interlude in the manner of traditional fantasy song sequences. But in its dream-like ambiguity it exudes that mirage of an *elsewhere*. In Arjun's desire for Laila, the woman he loves, which the song is designed to communicate, the sequence can be said to articulate the larger desire of an audience's ludic longing for this idealized *elsewhere*. Pallasmaa observes how "the crucial faculty of the image is its magical capacity to mediate between physical and mental, perceptual and imaginary, factual and affectual" (*Embodied Image* 40). In its visual and auditory pull, the image of the Spanish landscape unfolding on multiplex screens is embroiled in a similar encounter with its audience, facilitating its experiencing as part of our existential world. Thus, the *terrain of possibilities* that *ZNMD* aspires to are much more expansive than mere fantasy setting. Spain is not a dream, but an extension of the privileged space that its three protagonists inhabit in India too. They are able to fly to Barcelona, ensconce themselves in plush hotels, and rent a convertible to drive through the country.

In other words, *ZNMD* operates within the familiar framework of the road movie's narrative structure, which entails the transposition of the protagonists from the

secure bounds of a familiar environment to an unfamiliar one. The genre of the road movie emerged in the late 1960s under the influence of "the beat writers of the 1950s and legitimized by its countercultural valorisation of existentialist philosophy" (Brereton 107). *Easy Rider*, released in 1968, became the quintessential road movie, the precursor to this existentialist genre, capable of accommodating a wide range of flexible themes. In India, this genre gave birth to a growing canon of road movies like *Road* (2002), *Jab We Met*[19] (2007), *Road, Movie* (2009), *Finding Fanny* (2014), *Highway* (2014), *NH31* (2015), *Piku* (2015), *Qarib Qarib Single*[20] (2017), *Karwaan*[21] (2018), etc., all of which follow the generic tradition of quest driven parallel journeys of internal and external discoveries. *ZNMD* follows a similar template where the journey that structures this film is motivated by a quest of personal development, the movement across the Spanish landscape designed to function as a catalyst for self-discovery. "The twin notions of mobility and freedom are what road movies are built around […] the movement of the car itself [becoming] a symbol of hope" (Brereton 106).

Within the road movie's framework of journey from the familiar to the unfamiliar and back to the known, it is in the encounter with the unfamiliar space, whether ludic or fraught, that constitutes the raison d'etre of the genre. But within the road movie's framework of the journey as rite of passage, *ZNMD* eschews the transformative experience arising from an intense interaction, physical or spiritual, with the outer world. Instead, the terrain of possibilities that *ZNMD* lays out for its three protagonists in the *elsewhere* of Spain is one that is intensely self-involved. Whether skydiving, deep-sea diving, or taking part in the Pamplona Bull Run—activities expressly chosen to resolve their individual fears and phobias—their engagement has the smooth, reasoned quality of a designed experience. Their method of encounter with the landscape is devoid of any complex or layered attachments, and in passing through towns, lakes, coastlines, and festivals, the landscape is reduced to a series of consumable sites. It is a touristic gaze, interspersed with designer daydreams, that marks their journey through the Spanish landscape. This is an *elsewhere* of air-conditioned comfort, its jagged edges smoothed off, packaged for the consumption of an audience ensconced in the plush and comfortably cooled auditoriums of multiplex theatres. The Spanish landscape is shaped as picturesque and exotic, designed to seduce the traveler and, by extension, the audience. It reinforces a particular way of seeing the world, where the encounter with place is constructed out of a remote gaze of sightseeing and fantasy, and their interaction with the landscape/place is unable to effect any real self-discovery or transformation.

The import of *ZNMD*'s landscape lies in this delivery of packaged consumption, in the ease, comfort, and smoothness of its transference on screen, in its facilitation of an easy accessibility to an *elsewhere*. The characters are a bridge to this *elsewhere*, modeling the casual negotiation and engagement with a foreign place while remaining cocooned within the borders of their own cultural identities. *ZNMD* is not about the immersion and transmogrification of its characters through a primal landscape, but rather about the ease of stepping into a controlled *elsewhere* and inhabiting it. It is this familiarized *elsewhere*

[19]*Ed. N.*: *Jab We Met* can be translated as *When We Met*.
[20]*Ed. N.*: *Qarib Qarib Single* can be translated as *Almost Almost Single*.
[21]*Ed. N.*: *Karwaan* can be translated as *Caravan* or *Journey*.

that reverberates with its own meaning, even as it intersects and interweaves with the trajectory of the narrative arc.

ZNMD can be read as having a ritual function for its audience, taking them on a drive through Spain. It offers the illusion of the ultimate travel fantasy—freedom. For the three protagonists, the desire for this *elsewhere* is constructed through their seeking of places that provide pleasure or escape from the urban stresses of India, and their privileged access to it. Freedom is sourced in a benign, romantic, peaceful getaway that leaves behind the teeming urban spaces of India to an *elsewhere* that is seductive, romantic, and charming, in service to the traveler's indulgence and pleasure. This displacement—to escape someplace else, to occupy and see somewhere else—summons all the elements of privilege, desire, and play to construct this space of an *elsewhere* that is attainable. It becomes a transitional space, an imaginative doorway to an expansive terrain of possibilities. *ZNMD*'s manufacturing of this encounter with the Spanish landscape, structured by an ordered progression along the motorway interrupted by interludes of designed diversions—from a flamenco dance-off to a tomato festival and various adventure sports in between—is insistent on a fascination with playing away. It is an encounter designed to place the multiplex spectators as imaginers, inviting an *unconscious exchange* between the audience and the places on screen. Pallasmaa observes that in the experiencing of space "is a dialogue, a kind of exchange – I place myself in the space and the space settles in me" (*Architecture of Image* 22). *ZNMD*'s Spanish landscape effects this intersection with the multiplex imagination, offering this vista of an expansive *elsewhere* in which to re-invent or make a new beginning.

ZNMD and *Shanghai* unfold their respective *elsewheres* in different contexts, the shaping of their *away* contingent on the differing exigencies of their narrative realities. *Shanghai*'s landscape opens up a "terrain of possibilities" offering glimpses into new ways of experiencing everyday life. It transforms from inert background or setting into something with a processual dynamic, conveying a sense of transition, of becoming, its spaces holding the potentiality of transformation. *Elsewhere*, whether as dream or nightmare (considering which side of the class divide one is on), animates this landscape, accentuating it and binding it to the imagination. It engages in a complex way, as a pervasive presence, unfolding as an associative and emotionally responsive space, a geography of the mind into which we root our imagination. Wollen observes how the cultural change in our times propelled by globalization seems to involve "a move away from a tactile to an optical apprehension of the world, to a fascination with seeing at a distance, with access to an *elsewhere*, rather than learning to inhabit a space […]" (214). In *Shanghai* it is this "fascination," this potent pull of the distant *elsewhere* that activates the narrative arc and gives shape to the lives of its characters. As the activist, Dr. Ahmedi, protests the razing of Bharat Nagar and the displacement of its community and the government and bureaucracy remain undeterred and fixated on the vision of a Shanghai-like international business hub, the film throbs with the conflicting values of opposing forces, a force-field of contrasting trajectories of actions and intentions, tethered to this invisible pull of the *elsewhere*.

Landscape in *Shanghai* thus transforms from being a significant setting to a sentient, potent element held together by its own meaning, its expressiveness amplified

by its engaging of the audience's imagination in the totality of its meaning-making. Even while throbbing in tandem with the immediacy of the narrative trajectory, it asserts its own act of mediation, translating Bharat Nagar as an Indian *everycity* and its fantasy of *elsewhere* as the urban middle class dream. But while *Shanghai's elsewhere* waits at the periphery, as a dream, its unfolding complicated by a class struggle over land, *ZNMD*'s *elsewhere* is already here, neatly packaged and easily accessible. Its spatial vision outlines a new psychogeographical imagination, embodying an expansive view of the world, of global connections and intersections, catering to an audience fascinated "with seeing at a distance, [and] with access to [this] elsewhere" (Wollen 214). Spain is far as well as near, existing in a dynamic of proximity and distance, illuminating where we are not, but showing us where we can be. Even though unfolding in contrasting contexts—one fraught with the anxiety of the globalizing world and the other gliding into the matrix of the smooth transnational spaces inhabited by the multiplexed imagination—both these films enact a collage of connecting and intersecting spaces, forging an assemblage of imagined experiences, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings that give rise to a new imaginative reality.

Works Cited

Abraham, Nicolas, and Maria Torok. "Mourning or Melancholia: Introjection versus Incorporation." *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 1, U of Chicago P, 1994, pp. 125–38.

Andrews, Hazel, and Les Roberts. *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience and Spaces In-between*. Routledge, 2012.

Appadurai, Arjun. "Illusion of Permanence: Interview with Arjun Appadurai by Perspecta 34." *Perspecta*, vol. 34, 2003, pp. 44–52. JSTOR. www.jstor.org/stable/1567314.

---. "The Right to Participate in the Work of the Imagination." *TransUrbanism*, edited by Joke Brouwer and Arjen Mulder, V2_Publishing/NAi, 2002, pp. 33–46.

Athique, Adrian, and Douglas Hill. *The Multiplex in India: A Cultural Economy of Urban Leisure*. Routledge, 2010.

Bamzai, Kaveree. "Shrinking Screen." *India Today*, www.indiatoday.in/magazine/cover-story/story/20151221-india-today-40th-anniversary-kaveree-bamzai-shrinking screen-bollywood-820978-2015-12-10.

Bhatia, Vivek. "Dibakar Banerjee on Wife, Films & Salman Khan." https://www.idiva.com/entertainment/bollywood/dibakar-banerjee-on-wife-films-salman-khan/13536.

Brereton, Pat. *Hollywood Utopia: Ecology in Contemporary American Cinema*. Intellect, 2004.

Bruno, Giuliana. *Public Intimacy: Architecture and the Visual Arts*. MIT Press, 2007.

CNBCTV18. "From Priya Village Roadshow to PVR: How Ajay Bijli built India's largest multiplex chain." www.cnbctv18.com/business/from-priya-village-roadshow-to-pvr-how-ajay-bijli-built-indias-largest-multiplex-chain-7262591.htm.

Dwyer, Rachel. *Yash Chopra: Fifty Years in Indian Cinema*. Lotus Collection, 2002.

Eisenstein, Sergej. *Nonindifferent Nature*. Cambridge UP, 1987.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias." *Architecture/ Mouvement/ Continuité*, translated by Jay Miskowiec, March 1984, www.web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf.

Gopal, Sangita. *Conjugations: Marriage and Form in New Bollywood Cinema*. Chicago UP, 2011.

Hay, James. "Piecing Together What Remains of the Cinematic City." *The Cinematic*

City, edited by David B. Clarke, Routledge, 1997, pp. 211–32.

King, Anthony Douglas. *Spaces of Global Culture: Architecture, Urbanism, Identity*. Routledge, 2004.

KPMG-FICCI Report 2016. "The Future: Now Streaming." *Indian Media and Entertainment Industry Report 2016*, aibmda.in/FICCI-KPMG-M&E-Report-2016.pdf.

KPMG Report 2019. "India's Digital Future: Mass of Niches." *KPMG in India's Media and Entertainment Report 2019: A Synopsis*, assets.kpmg/content/dam/kpmg/in/pdf/2019/08/Synopsis-india-mediaentertainment-report_2019.pdf.

Mazumdar, Ranjani. *Bombay Cinema: An Archive of the City*. U of Minneapolis P, 2007.

Mishra, Pankaj. "Shanghaied into Modernity: An Excerpt from Pankaj Mishra's 'A Great Clamour.'" *Tehelka.com*.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Landscape and Power*. U of Chicago Press, 1994.

Pallasmaa, Juhani. *The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema*. Rakennustieto Oy, 2001.

---. *The Embodied Image: Imagination and Imagery in Architecture*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Pinto, Viveat Susan. "Multiplex major PVR plans mega release, set to launch 40 screens in FY22." *Business Standard*, https://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/multiplex-major-pvr-plans-mega-release-set-to-launch-40-screens-in-fy22-121030501435_1.html.

Prasad, Madhava. "Realism and Fantasy in Representations of Metropolitan Life in Indian Cinema." *City Flicks: Indian Cinema and the Urban Experience*, edited by Preben Kaarsholm, Seagull, 2004, pp. 83–99.

Shanghai. Directed by Dibakar Banerjee. Performances by Kalki Koechlin, Abhay Deol, and Emraan Hashmi, Dibakar Banerjee Productions, 2012.

Statista Research Department. "Number of cinema screens across India in 2019, by multiplex chain." *Statista.com*, www.statista.com/statistics/948726/india-number-of-cinema-screens-of-major-multiplex-companies.

Sundaram, Ravi. "Uncanny Networks: Pirate, Urban and New Globalisation." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2004, pp. 64–71. www.epw.in/journal/2004/01/special-articles/uncanny-networks.html.

Tuan, Yi-fu. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Columbia UP, 1990.

Turner, Victor W. “Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in Rites De Passage.” *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, Cornell UP, 1967.

Vasudevan, Ravi. *The Melodramatic Public: Film Form and Spectatorship in Indian Cinema*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Wollen, Peter. *Paris Hollywood: Writings on Film*. Verso, 2002.

Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara. Directed by Zoya Akhtar. Performances by Hrithik Roshan, Farhan Akhtar, Abhay Deol, Katrina Kaif, and Kalki Koechlin, Excel Entertainment, 2011.